



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/624,524	07/24/2000	Andrea Schmidt	DE919950047US2	6841

7590

09/23/2004

Floyd A Gonzalez
IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
2455 South Road P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER

SHRADER, LAWRENCE J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2124

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/624,524

Applicant(s)

SCHMIDT ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence Shrader

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 46-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The cancellation of claims 1 – 45, and the addition of new claims 46 – 81 for examination are acknowledged.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the length exceeds 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Claim Objections

3. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

It appears that claim number 72 is inadvertently repeated on page 9 of the amendment. Accordingly, since the claim language itself was not repeated, claims 72 (starting with the second claim 72) through 80 should be renumbered 73 through 81.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 47, 59, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claims 47, 59, and 71, the terms "large number" and "small number" are relative terms, which render the claims indefinite. The terms "large number" and "small number" are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 46 – 55; 58 – 67; and 70 – 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by White, U.S. Patent 5,428,782.

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 46:

"arranging one or more of the Business Applications into one or more Transaction Objects;

arranging one or more of said Transaction Objects into one or more Transaction Object Methods enabled to transparently and autonomously execute the underlying Business Applications by handling a sequence of Business Application panels;"

White discloses construction of application components, and creates object modules to perform services for the application program to execute the application through processing panels (column 9, line 58 to column 10, line 48; column 20, lines 40 - 45).

"transparently signaling Transaction Objects in at least one of said Transaction Object Methods to execute Business Applications to create Business Objects, said Business Objects being maintained in Business Object Instance Space in the database;"

White discloses transparent signaling of database objects in a distributed environment (column 17, lines 38 - 48).

"communicating between Transaction Objects in said Transaction Object Methods with messages arranged in defined Transaction Records, each Transaction Record being instantiated with a related one Transaction Object to supply or retrieve data as part of the related one Transaction Object invocation; and"

White discloses transaction records allowing the panels to execute the application and retrieve data (column 10, lines 7 - 48).

"retrieving Business Objects from said Business Object Instance Space automatically and placing said retrieved Business Object in a Transaction Record when said retrieved Business Object is needed later in the Transaction Object Method such that Business Objects may be reused."

White discloses retrieving application objects from libraries to be reused by the transaction records in the application panels (column 10, lines 7 - 18).

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 47, incorporating the rejection of claim 46:

"...further comprising:

arranging said Business Applications and said Transactions Objects from a large number of Business Applications to form a new application system comprising at least one Transaction Object Method having a small number Business Applications and interaction of Transaction Record messages between said Transaction Objects."

White discloses a means to arrange business applications and transaction objects from a number of applications including menu functions between applications (column 4, lines 14 – 19; column 4 line 52 – column 5, line 2).

In regard to claim 48, incorporating the rejection of claim 47:

"...wherein said Transaction Object Method formed of said new application system is uniquely identified by user chosen identifier."

White discloses a user profile that is stored with the transaction view data (column 8, lines 37 – 50).

In regard to claim 49, incorporating the rejection of claim 46:

"...wherein said Transaction Record comprises an external Transaction Record which calls another Transaction Object."

See White column 8, lines 23 – 50.

In regard to claim 50, incorporating the rejection of claim 46:

"...wherein said Transaction Record comprises an internal Transaction Record which starts the Transaction Object."

See White column 10, lines 12 – 18.

In regard to claim 51, incorporating the rejection of claim 46:

"...wherein said Transaction Record comprises a preemptive Transaction Record which contains data which is provided in advance for use by a Transaction Object Method."

Art Unit: 2124

See White column 10, lines 42 – 48 for providing advance data for the transaction method.

In regard to claim 52, incorporating the rejection of claim 46:

"...wherein said Transaction Record comprises an interactive which contains data which is not provided in advance, but whose data is the result of earlier run Transaction Objects run by said Transaction Object Method."

White discloses user interactive transactions that share transaction and terminal resources (column 17, lines 25 – 48).

In regard to claim 53, incorporating the rejection of claim 46:

"...wherein said Transaction Record includes parameters and keystrokes."

White discloses parameters and function key support for the transactions (column 57, lines 27 – 44).

In regard to claim 54, incorporating the rejection of claim 53:

"...wherein said keystrokes include keystrokes generated by PF keys."

White discloses parameters and function key support for the transactions (column 57, lines 27 – 44).

In regard to claim 55, incorporating the rejection of claim 46:

"...further comprising detecting all Transaction Records needed for said Transaction Object Method and automatically associating said Transaction Object Method with said detected needed Transaction Records."

White discloses the GTD as a blueprint for constructing a transaction with all the necessary information (column 9, lines 58 – 66).

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 58 (an apparatus): It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 46 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 59, incorporating the rejection of claim 58: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 47 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 60, incorporating the rejection of claim 59: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 48 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 61, incorporating the rejection of claim 58: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 49 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 62, incorporating the rejection of claim 58: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 50 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 63, incorporating the rejection of claim 58: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 51 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 64, incorporating the rejection of claim 58: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 52 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 65, incorporating the rejection of claim 58: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 53 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 66, incorporating the rejection of claim 65: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 54 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 67, incorporating the rejection of claim 58: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 55 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 70 (a program product): It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 46 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 71, incorporating the rejection of claim 70: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 47 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 72, incorporating the rejection of claim 71: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 48 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 73, incorporating the rejection of claim 70: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 49 (a corresponding method).

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 74, incorporating the rejection of claim 70: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 50 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 75, incorporating the rejection of claim 70: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 51 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 76, incorporating the rejection of claim 70: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 52 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 77, incorporating the rejection of claim 70: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 53 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 78, incorporating the rejection of claim 77: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 54 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 79, incorporating the rejection of claim 70: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 55 (a corresponding method).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 56, 57, 68, 69, 80 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White, U.S. Patent 5,428,782 as applied to claims 46, 58, and 70 respectively above, and further in view of Chen et al., U.S. Patent 5,806,062 (hereinafter referred to as Chen).

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 56, incorporating the rejection of claim 46:

"...wherein said Transaction Object Methods are placed into a graph, said graph showing successors and predecessors of Business Applications, Transactions Objects and Business Objects making up said Transaction Object Methods."

White discloses a view stack for storing the relevant data from the application (column 16, lines 42 – 47; column 137, line 51 to column 138, line 3), but does not teach viewing the data with a user interaction graph. However, Chen teaches the use of a directed user interaction graph (column 17, lines 59 – 65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a business application storing view-data in a stack as taught by White, and modify it with the interactive user graph as taught by Chen, because then the user would additionally have a interactive graphical display of the data on the view-stack as opposed to only tabular or panel display data thereby making the user interaction more efficient.

In regard to claim 57, incorporating the rejection of claim 56:

"...wherein said graph is analyzed to determine if all data and Business Objects are known to perform said Transaction Object Methods from legacy Business Applications."

White teaches the progressive processing of a panel by the Business Application through a view stack (column 16, lines 42 – 47; column 137, line 51 to column 138, line 3), but does not teach using the sequence within a user interaction graph. However, Chen teaches a directed user interaction graph (column 17, lines 59 – 65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a business application storing view-data in a stack as taught by White, and modify it with the interactive user graph as taught by Chen, because then the user would have a visual representation of the relationships in panel

Art Unit: 2124

structure and provided a more efficient means to manipulate the system based on that graphical information.

In regard to claim 68, incorporating the rejection of claim 58: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 56 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 69, incorporating the rejection of claim 68: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 57 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 80, incorporating the rejection of claim 70: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 56 (a corresponding method).

In regard to claim 81, incorporating the rejection of claim 80: It is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 57 (a corresponding method).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Shrader whose telephone number is (703) 305-8046.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 08:00-16:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2124

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lawrence Shrader
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

14 September 2004



ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER